

Aboard the Savannah itself, Adm. John M. Will, board chairman of American Export-Isbrandtsen Line, whose wholly-owned subsidiary is the First Atomic Ship Transport, said:

"The whole future of the American merchant marine lies in high-speed, big ships run by nuclear power, and the big advantage of nuclear power is fuel saving."

CHEAPER THAN OIL

Three such vessels even bigger and faster than the Savannah would cost \$3.5 million less to operate than oil-fired ships of similar speed and size, he estimated.

The Savannah's master, Capt. A. R. Block Jr. of Cranston, R.I., whose four gold stripes are topped by an anchor surrounded by whirling atoms, spiked a waterfront legend.

"They say the seagulls never come near the Savannah," he said. "It's got nothing to do with radiation. We have no smokestack, and therefore no thermal drafts for gulls, like gliders, to ride on."

AN OLD SEA JOKE

Chief Engineer Fred Hirst, whose four gold stripes are topped by a propeller and whirling atoms, joked:

"There's another theory—an old one—if the gulls don't follow you, you're a hungry ship."

But, he quickly added, the Savannah is "the finest ship I've ever sailed in" during 30 years at sea, and he thought mothballing was for the gulls.

At 3:45 A.M. yesterday, the Savannah passed off Fire Island, virtually over the remnants of her namesake, which have lain at the bottom of the Atlantic since 1821.

And maybe she was jinxed right from the beginning when they named her after the vessel which, in 1819, was the first ship to cross the ocean aided by steam.

But the original Savannah was soon changed back to sail, because it didn't seem, in those days, that steam was here to stay.

SAVANNAH IS BACK TO A SAD WELCOME

PROTESTS GROW AT U.S. PLAN TO
WITHDRAW VESSEL

(By George Horne)

When the nuclear ship Savannah tied up at Pier C in Hoboken yesterday, steamship officials and relatives of the 64 members of her crew crowded around the gangplank waiting to go aboard and talk about the subject uppermost in their minds.

Although the costly ship, the only commercial vessel in the world powered by nuclear energy, is scheduled to make more voyages in the spring and summer, her future is in doubt because the Federal Government has announced that she will be withdrawn later this year.

The homecoming of the ship from Mediterranean ports was like a wake. Her well-comers included members of a new "Save Our Savannah" committee, which has been formed among ship buffs and maritime unions to mount a major campaign of protest to the White House and Congress against the withdrawal.

John Rogers, an admiralty lawyer, and Theodore W. Kheel, lawyer and arbitrator, have been named co-chairmen of the committee.

There has already been a spate of protests, including several from members of Congress. Another was made yesterday.

The New York City Council on Port Development and Promotion made public a telegram to President Johnson, urging him to rescind the lay-up order.

Mayor Lindsay is chairman of the council, and Commissioner Herbert B. Halberg of the Department of Marine and Aviation is co-chairman.

The council's message makes clear the strong feeling among critics of the Federal plan that the withdrawal of the vessel would destroy one of the country's most effective gestures of international goodwill.

The Savannah represents a planning and construction outlay aggregating \$83-million. It was planned and built to demonstrate the peaceful uses of atomic power, and has been visited by 1.5 million persons in her many voyages to foreign ports.

At present she is being operated—at a deficit—as an ordinary freighter under charter to First Atomic Ship Transport, a subsidiary of American Export-Isbrandtsen Lines.

The message to President Johnson from the council said that "considering the benefits in improving the image of the United States," the cost of maintaining the ship was "miniscule."

Copies of the message, which the council voted unanimously to send at a meeting earlier this week, have been forwarded to the state's congressional delegation, Mr. Halberg said.

Mr. Halberg said in a statement that the council regretted that there was "no stronger way of making its views known."

"We fervently hope," he said, "that the Federal officials when receiving the telegram will realize that the council represents a broad and deep spectrum of port interests and is a body most competent to gauge the effects on the fate and future of shipping and of the Port of New York, arising from the retirement of the Savannah."

Mr. Kheel said last night that he was ready to take an active part in the campaign for the ship and was awaiting suggestions from the committee.

In announcing the vessel's withdrawal, the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, said she was running a deficit of about \$3-million a year. But experts have said that this figure was too high and that, in any case, the cost of laying up the Savannah might be half of this amount annually.

John M. Will, retired Navy Admiral and head of the operating company, has urged the Government to reassign the Savannah to make demonstration voyages to the Orient, where she has never been shown.

Strengthening the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

SPEECH
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1967

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in introducing a resolution to strengthen the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. This resolution proposes to further the long-range development of the United Nations as a more effective instrument for building and maintaining peace.

Until such time as we can realize the existence of a permanent U.N. peacekeeping force, individually recruited by that world organization, I wholeheartedly agree with the immediate objective presented in this proposal.

Because of the swiftness with which most crises erupt, and the immediate need for dispatching specially trained and equipped peacekeeping forces, I am in favor of the earmarking of special units by the U.N. member states to be available for and readily placed under the command of the United Nations peacekeeping agency.

I believe that this country should be

especially willing to assist with the facilities for handling communications, transport, and logistical support for U.N. peacekeeping operations. It is essential that these forces for preserving peace have at their immediate disposal adequate materiel for conducting their operations successfully.

All of these supporting measures are directed at the final goal of a permanent and impartial United Nations peacekeeping force—a goal which I believe to be not only in the interests of our Nation, but vital to world progress and peace. I feel that this resolution is a meaningful and important step in the proper direction.

Infiltrating the Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1967

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been urging that we establish a joint congressional committee to review the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and all other units of the Federal Government engaged in intelligence work. The shocking revelation that the CIA has, for a number of years, been subsidizing the National Student Association is further and persuasive evidence, it seems to me, of the need for such a committee.

It may be that a Joint Committee on Intelligence Activities would have approved CIA's financial support and use of this leading student organization, although I doubt it. But at least this practice, and others like it, would have been subjected to the scrutiny and review of a broadly based panel of elected representatives. The safeguards inherent in such a continuing study and review would certainly be consistent with our belief in democratic institutions and an open society. It would certainly not be inconsistent with our own national security interests and would, in fact, I believe, advance them.

My own feelings concerning the "impropriety and folly" of permitting the CIA to subsidize the National Student Association are well described by the New York Times editorial of February 16, which I include for the attention and consideration of all Members:

INFILTRATING THE CAMPUS

The impropriety and folly of permitting the Central Intelligence Agency to subsidize the National Student Association cannot be mitigated by post-mortem rationalizing. It is absurd to suggest that, because the student organization was too impoverished to take part in international meetings, the C.I.A. merely assumed the role of a benevolent patron of youth.

It is not the business or the habit of intelligence services to underwrite indigent good causes unless the beneficiary can be expected to pay off the debt, directly or indirectly. It was more reprehensible for Washington to let its intelligence service jeopardize a representative voice of the nation's college youth than it was for a few student leaders, in secret agreement, to succumb to the temptation.

February 20, 1967

At least as serious has been the breach of public faith by private foundations acting as go-betweens. The very existence of foundations is a privilege granted by the tax-paying public. The mandate that goes with this tax exemption is to provide nongovernmental support for worthy causes, not to serve as a cover for clandestine Government operations.

The sordid episode has dealt another serious blow to the credibility of American students and scholars abroad. Faith in their detachment already had been damaged by earlier disclosures of secret links between the C.I.A. and some American universities. A total ban on all C.I.A. underwriting of collegiate activity is plainly long overdue.

It will be tragic if the present effect is an undermining of the National Student Association's total record. Often under fire from the right, it has usually represented courageous liberalism. To discredit the organization because of the secret indiscretion of a few of its leaders would sap the strength of elected student governments across the country and endow New Left extremists with unwarranted power just when their hold on students is crumbling.

More is needed now than a halt in C.I.A. subsidies to the N.S.A. or other academic organizations. All such groups should open their books and source of funds to their own membership and to public scrutiny. To permit a few student leaders to make far-reaching policy decisions without consent of the membership exposes them to pressures and temptations far beyond the scope of their political experience.

As for foundation activities, the penalties for engaging in undercover activities should be clearly established. The Patman investigations long ago made clear the need for reforms, and the President has promised to send to Congress this year proposals for stamping out abuses in foundation practices.

Most important, explicit guidelines should be laid down to regulate all policies of Government support of international activities of students and scholars. It is nonsense to suggest that, because they arouse suspicion abroad, public subsidies should not be offered. Virtually all nations offer such subsidy. The point at issue is how to provide the funds, without perverting the purpose.

A first step should be to speed the divorce, already suggested under the International Education Act of 1966, of international educational affairs from the foreign policy branches of the Government. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is far better suited to sponsor educational exchanges than the State Department, let alone the C.I.A.

Beyond specific action, it is imperative to understand that academic freedom may be as severely threatened by secret covenants as by overt political coercion. Democratic institutions never thrive by using totalitarian devices to combat totalitarianism.

President, and I am sure that Bill Moyers has had a perspective of the events of the world that cannot be duplicated. Seldom has the publisher and editor of any newspaper had this type of training. Since we here in Long Island pay a great deal of attention to the press, Mr. Moyers' coming will add a dimension to our lives. Therefore, we have a feeling of great expectation with respect to his coming career. And so I feel that I speak for all of the people of Long Island when I say to you that Washington's loss is Long Island's gain.

What Are We Trying To Do to the CIA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1967

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star of February 19 carried a sensible and needed editorial on the Central Intelligence Agency. It is entitled "What Are We Trying To Do to the CIA?" I believe it should be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(The article follows:)

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

It is just possible. If we all manage to work ourselves into a wild enough lather, that the current flap over the CIA can be escalated to the point where it will destroy the nation's intelligence organization. It almost seems that this is what some of the breast-beaters would like to do.

One day we have a disclosure that a student organization has been receiving covert funds so that young Americans can compete with young Communists at world student meetings. Then, suddenly, nothing will do but that every traceable operation of the CIA must be laid bare to public view, commented upon in tones of pious horror, investigated, sermonized, deplored and punished, until the terrible guilt of it all has been established for all time, for all the world to see.

And what, precisely, are we guilty of? Why, of using our wits and available means to complete in a battle just as real, dirty and deadly serious as any shooting war in which we could engage.

Confronted by adversaries who threw the full power and wealth of the state into the effort to mold and control world opinion, we did not abandon the field to them. Instead, we devoted some public funds to seeing to it that Americans could confront the totalitarians in the intellectual lists abroad, speaking their minds in representing the views of a relatively free society.

It worked, incidentally. A wide variety of Americans, most of whom never knew the source of the funds backing them, proved more than able over the years to hold their own in confrontation with disciplined, professional Communist agents. They prevented the takeover of numerous international organizations and established others which have contributed substantially to the global cause of freedom.

Consider, for example, the experience of Gloria Steinem, as interestingly reported in yesterday's Washington Post. A New York writer, Miss Steinem was director of something called "The Independent Research Service," which took CIA money to send several hundred young Americans to World Youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1969 and 1962.

Miss Steinem said she worked closely with CIA agents on the program, but that few of the students who took those trips knew that the CIA was picking up the tab.

"I never felt I was being dictated to at all," she said. "I found them (the CIA men with whom she worked) liberal and farsighted and open to an exchange of ideas. . . . They wanted to do what we wanted to do—present a healthy, diverse view of the United States."

She was backed up by Dennis Shaul, another spokesman for the organization, who said: "We had Minnesota schoolteachers who were further right than Bill Buckley as well as members of Students for a Democratic Society. Nobody told them what to do."

Bear in mind, except for such American participation financed by CIA funds, these festivals were completely dominated by Communists, all financed and controlled by their governments. Yet, says Shaul, "The Helsinki festival was a disaster from their point of view, and I think we can take a good deal of credit for that."

Well now, why not? Is this really something that has to be apologized for? Who is corrupted by such an operation? Who would have paid the American's expenses if the CIA hadn't?

"The CIA," says Miss Steinem, "was the only (organization) with enough guts and foresight to see that youth and student affairs were important." And here, the lady puts her finger on an important point.

Of course, it would have been better if this sort of thing could have been done without subterfuge. It is too bad that private funds were not available for these purposes. It would have been healthier lacking such private sources, for our government to have appropriated openly the necessary monies, through the State Department, U.S. Information Agency or some other "respectable" organization. Even though no such alternative may have been available when these programs were initiated in the early 1950s, it would have been advisable to switch them away from CIA support as soon as that became possible.

No one, moreover, can possibly defend all the details of any one of these operations. No doubt there have been messy procedures which, when exposed, prove embarrassing. There is, one inevitably recalls, a saying about making omelettes and breaking eggs.

What is beyond comprehension in all this, however, is the monumental naivete involved in the apparent shock reaction to these disclosures on the part of otherwise knowledgeable people. After all, what have the outraged gentlemen supposed was going on all this time on the sprawling acres out at Langley? Of all the endeavors of the CIA, the effort to create outlets abroad for the expression of American opinion must surely rank as one of the milder. This is not, be it noted, a tea party that we have been engaged in. This is a viciously contested undercover war against shrewd, dedicated enemies who happen to be quite unhampered by nice-Neillie scruples. The need to press this fight has all along been recognized by the top leadership of the country. The procedures that suddenly evoke such outraged reactions were not dreamed up privately by the CIA. They were directed from the top, and properly so.

The idea that an organization like the CIA can conduct its operations while restrained by a sort of daisy-chain of clergymen, den mothers and liberal politicians—such a notion is simply absurd. For our part, we hope that the present hysteria will be calmed with a rational inquiry conducted by responsible and realistic men who have some knowledge of this very serious problem involved. We are inclined to suspect that they, and the public, will end up concluding that the world has not, after all, ended—and that, in doing a job which had to be done, our intelligence organization has not done too badly.

A Welcome to Mr. Bill Moyers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, we of Long Island are proud of our good fortune to have drawn Mr. Bill Moyers to this part of our country. From the onset of this administration he has occupied an unusual position. One gains extraordinary insight by being at the right hand of a